

Reference your letter page 4, paragraph 4: Claims 2-16 rejected... over Wright (6588165)

- Claim 1: Wright has a device for mounting a wall panel to an underlying wall surface. This underlying surface receives an end of a wall panel to be mounted thereon. There may be a degree of similarity in the projections used to fasten mechanism used to fasten one piece to another but that's where it ends. My system is for ceiling attachment only and the entire decorative section is attached by way of a locking step, not simply one point on a panel. In addition, my system carries the weight of the molding whereas Wright's system does not carry the weight of the wall panel.
- Claim 2: Wright is inserting fingers to form a joint between two wall panels whereas I am fastening a decorative molding to a ceiling.
- Claim 3: No contest.
- Claim 4: Wright's outer cap is made of metal. Although the insertion fingers should be made of a pliable material, I cannot make a decorative finished product out of metal. It must have a wood, plaster or painted finish.
- Claim 5: Wright has a slight alpha angle on the projections. I have one rigid projection and one flexible with no predetermined angle because it must remain flexible to snap back into its original position.
- Claim 6: Wright's claim is based on being "centered". The flexibility of my projections on the bottom channel would be self-centering because they will snap into their original position.
- Claim 7: Wright's claim deals with water-shedding edges and rain-drip edges. My claim is centered on an interior decorative molding that only has aesthetic purposes and not any industrial use for the exterior of buildings.
- Claim 8: No contest.
- Claim 9: Wright deals with a plurality of thickness thereby necessitating detent positions. No contest.
- Claim 10: No contest.
- Claims 11-18: No contest as they deal with a variation.

Conclusions

In relation to Wright: It appears as though exterior wall mounted panels are the focus of this invention. Features facilitating mounting and removal, sealing, weathering and durability are worthy features but in no way apply to my invention. These would be the redeeming qualities of an industrial product that is meant to withstand the elements and inclement weather. I am dealing strictly with an interior decorative molding that is limitless in the number of geometric patterns that could be established. Ultimately, value would be added to a residential property and most certainly make a dining room more appealing whereas Wright has a much different function in mind.

There also is a large amount of caulking involved in sealing the seams of the wall panels. My invention has no large surfaces that require caulking, no small surfaces that require caulking, no rain-edges for run-off from weather fluctuations. I do not require any weep holes in my ceiling and I do not have to be concerned with water drainage. If there is water involved, there must be a leaky roof or a plumbing problem.

I would state without equivocation that the structural and technical differences are so vast that these inventions are remotely similar at best. In fact, I would suggest that my invention would stand as a wall molding, whereas the integrity of Wright's would be compromised as a ceiling molding.

Regarding Bobath:

- Claim 1: Bobath is joining wall panels in sections of at least two. I have no relation to walls and no relation to ceiling sections. My invention deals with a molding on the ceiling and no connections between sections. By virtue of the definition of molding, I am dealing with something fine, possibly fragile and certainly architectural (geometrical) in nature rather than wall panels and portions.
- Claim 2: Bobath's wall portions are substantially parallel to each other whereas my ceiling moldings are predominantly parallel and perpendicular. Although I would have no difficulty with octagons, hexagons, or any other geometric pattern, I would have a difficult time forming a perfect circle.

- Claim 3: No contest.
- Claim 4: Substantially 90 degrees whereas mine is virtually limitless.
- Claim 5: Although there may be similarity in "elongation", Bobath is referring to a device for joining wall panels whereas I am adding a feature molding to a wall rather than using it to *make* a wall.
- Claim 6: Wall panels.
- Claim 7-9: These claims pertain to walls whereas I am exclusive to ceilings.

In relation to Bobath: His invention deals with a device to join wall panels together and build vehicle bodies as well as constructing office partitions and kitchen cabinets. This invention is exclusive to joining wall panels in a variety of industrial applications. At no point is the term ceiling evident. In addition, there is no mention of moldings or geometrical patterns.

I would suggest that the function of my molded ceiling system has a much different value albeit intrinsic. The aforementioned systems of Wright and Bobath have a very practical industrial application and are therefore markedly different from what I have proposed. I would further suggest that the commonality between these two patents is much greater than either of them has to my application.

In conclusion, it is not reasonable to take either one of the aforementioned patents cited and apply them to a ceiling. I am not making any attempt whatsoever to install panels on either walls or ceilings. The structural integrity of the two patterns cited would be compromised if either was applied to an aesthetic ceiling system.

I firmly believe that my application has the ability and strength to stand alone in the structural and technical aspects and I would hope that I have provided enough information and defense to allow my application to proceed. Please do not hesitate to contact me if there is any further information required.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "William M. Jamison". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned below the "Respectfully," text.